DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 715 HE 000 714

By-Metty, Michael P.

The Departmental Chairman and the Public Institution or It's a Bird, It's a Plane, No It's a .....

American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 4 Mar 69
Note-8p.; Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education's 24th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., Mar 2-5, 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
Descriptors-*Administrative Personnel, *Administrator Characteristics, *Administrator Role, Faculty, Governance, *Higher Education
Identifiers-Campus Governance Project, *Department Chairman

The Campus Governance Project investigated the nature and significance of the governance processes on 17 institutionally diverse colleges and universities in order to find commonalities across and within institutions. A pre-interview questionnaire was designed to elicit perceived problems at the institution and names of people seen as good sources of information and effective problem solvers. The people most often mentioned as well as a sample of faculty, students, and administrators were interviewed about the way their institution was run. One of the objectives was to define the role of the department chairman. In comparing the data concerning department chairmen with analyses of other faculty groups, significant differences were found in views regarding general resources and control of the academic program. The data delineate a role that is molded by polar demands "which condition the nature of personal interaction and the social matrix of the problem", a position that is, "by definition, schizophrenic." The interviews highlight the nature and dimensions of the concern for resources and facilities. Recruiting and budgeting are obsessions and committee work is deemed important. Individuals are seen as interchangeable parts of a functioning machine and few chairmen engage in establishing goals. Nevertheless, signs of discontent are rare. Examples of styles of operation, such as the politician/power broker, gigolo, or entrepreneur/hustler, illustrate some of the findings. (JS)

ED028715

(3)

METTY, MICHAEL P.

THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN AND THE PUBLIC INSTITUTION OR IT'S A BIRD, IT'S A PLANE, NO IT's A....

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 114

Special Session IV
Monday, March 4

THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN AND THE PUBLIC INSTITUTION OR IT'S A BIRD, IT'S A PLANE, NO IT'S A ..... *

MICHAEL P. MATTY
Co-director of Research and Education
Antioch-Putney Graduate School of Education

Background of the Study:

The Campus Governance Project of the AAHE was instituted to investigate the nature and significance of the governance processes on a variety of campuses. The term governance, popularized by Corson (1960), deals with the "process of deciding and of seeing to it that the decisions made are executed". The process, as we defined it, came to mean the establishment and implementation of policies and rules along with the everyday succession of decisions. It becomes an attempt to describe the on going work of the participants of the institution--what they do, what they say they do and what they think they do, or to be less precise but more formal a socio-perceptual model.

The project consisted, essentially, of a multi-method study of seventeen colleges and universities scattered across the country and institutionally diverse. Thus we looked at schools that were large and small, public and private, liberal arts and vocational-professional and multi-dimensional versus single thrust as well as several schools that were in the middle of vast changes. The object, in selecting such a mixed bag, was to find commonalities across institutions and within kinds of institutions so that some normative data might be made available as well as the conventional research findings that are buried and forgotten.

The study design called for the administration of a Pre-Interview Questionnaire that was designed to elicit perceived problems at the institution and the names of people who were seen as good sources of information and effective problem solvers. Those people most often mentioned along with a sample of other participants (including faculty, students and administrators) were interviewed by a team of visitors about the way their institution was run.

The Role of the Department Chariman:

One of our concerns was a study of departmental chairmen within and across these institutions--what kinds of problems did they see as important and how did these perceptions differ from other groups; what styles or roles were assumed by the chairmen in the performance of their duties; and what kind of influence and power does the department chairman have?

Our interest is based on the fact that the literature of higher education contains a fair amount of speculation about the department chairman but little empirical study of the role. Some feel that the institution is a set of independent sovereignties competing for resources (Dahl, 1960) while others talk about departments as a community of scholars that serves as the basic administrative unit of the college.

---

* Paper presented to Special Session IV on "The role of the department chairman" at the 24th National Confernece on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Monday afternoon, March 3. Permission to quote restricted.

(Andersen, 1968) or a familiar and comfortable status system that orients new members and protects older members (Walker and Holmes, 1960). The most widespread commentary deals with opposing perceptions of the departmental chairman as a middle manager in an organization or as a political operator. One can conclude, then, that little is known about who or what the departmental chairman is and that myths, old or new, continue to be the supreme source of information about a role that is acknowledged to be important.

Empirical Findings:

In our attempt to answer the question about where the departmental chairmen stand in relation to other groups in the institution we factor analyzed our data on perceived problems and compared the views. Previous analyses led us to believe that we must separate public and private institutions because they were quite different in their governance patterns and styles. When we compare the departmental chairmen with junior and senior faculty in publicly controlled institutions we find that the departmental chairmen are significantly more concerned ($>.001$*) with general resources than the faculty, although this too is the area of the faculty's highest concern. This area includes space for faculty, office services, financial support for the educational program, science and research resources, educational buildings and space. Thus this factor could be interpreted as dealing with the physical services for the workers.

In addition we find that the department chairmen differ significantly ($>.05$) from the faculty in terms of a higher concern for resources for cultural and esthetic experiences and stimulation which includes recreational space, resources and space for student activities, student involvement, resources for humanities and the library. This factor seems to involve both a student centered component and a concern for the enrichment of the cultural environment and it would be indeed encouraging if the faculty were very concerned. Specifically the department chairmen are more concerned than the faculty but the faculty is so unconcerned as to be effectively removed from this area. The final area in which the departmental chairmen differ from the faculty is their concern for the control of the academic program. In this area, which involves decision making for the faculty, quality of administration, confidentially or respect for the individual and curricular and institutional change, the departmental chairmen were significantly less concerned ($>.05$) than their faculty peers. This would seem to indicate that the chairman perceives fewer problems in an area where he can be seen as a principal actor.

Areas where there were no significant overall differences included: 1. control of social and political behavior (participation in establishing social relations, regulations about social, personal and political behavior; 2. the educational experience (teaching, academic requirements, counseling and advising, student dignity); and 3. faculty performance and behavior (commitment to research, faculty relationships, and faculty role and quality). We find ourselves deeply concerned with two areas that would be considered by many to be the key issues in a department chairman's job--guiding the educational experience and dealing with the faculty about what they do and how well they do it.

A detailed analysis of the individual items of concern in a normative context reveals that the departmental chairmen are "overconcerned" (relative to faculty and administrators) about administrative procedures, financial support for research, provision

---

* 1 way ANOVA

for artistic performances, faculty publications and research, and the quality of the faculty. They are "underconcerned" about financial support for instruction, stimulation from students, opportunity to participate in departmental decisions, relations between faculty and administration, opportunity to participate in institutional decisions, grading practices, relevance of courses to student needs, class schedules and teaching loads, and relations between faculty and staff. What we see, normatively, is a major concern for facilities and production and a relative lack of concern for teaching and decision processes. We feel that this data raises rather serious concerns about what the role of the department chairman is or more crassly what is his job as "first among equals".

In order to find where the department chairmen match the perceptions of other groups, we discovered that they were similar to the faculty in some student oriented areas like parking facilities, transportation, a student union, adequacy and availability of counseling, academic advising and health services, and shared some colleague centered concerns about resources for the humanities, performing facilities, studios, museums, collections and the like. On the other hand they mirror administrative concerns about space for administrative and faculty offices, classrooms and lecture halls, research room and facilities like the computer. A more informative area concerns those items that show a split between faculty and administration and where the departmental chairmen fall between them--that is a true case of failure to identify with a reference goup. The areas where these splits occur include financial support for the educational program (including instructional support, sabbatical leaves, salaries and fringe benefits, financial support for research, equipment and staff); space and resources for student activity (which includes informal social space, meeting space, food services and financial resources for student services); faculty decision making (made up of participation at the various levels of the institutional process, hiring and firing, promotion and tenure, handling complaints and departmental organization); administration quality (including responsiveness, the nature of relationships and the support of new ideas); teaching (which consists of methods, ability, committment, grading and testing, interest in and intellectual discussions); and finally quality of students. In simple numerical terms the department chairman is not at home--perceptually speaking--very much of the time. The items that many of us consider critical for the man on the firing line are those which the individual is most conflicted about. Is it possible that the department chairman, like the concentration camp victim or the child being bullied, tends to identify with the aggressor? That is, does he perceive problems only when he is pushed to see them and has no counter balancing force to fend them off?

Our data delineates a role that is molded by polar demands--demands that may not be clear to the divergent groups or to the chairman but which condition the nature of personal interaction and the social matrix of the problem. Since the departmental chairman has to represent several groups to each other and to operate as a member of these groups the role demands are loaded with potential conflict and the position becomes, by definition, schizophrenic. At the very least this may be a job that is impossible to do even poorly.

Interview Findings:

We should now like to talk about how the interviews we conducted reflect and extend our previous data and look at some of the roles and predominant styles of the department chairman. Is he, as McKeachie (1968) points out "ill-prepared, inadequately supported and more to be pitied than censured?" Does the department chairman serve as the agent of rigidity, isolation and self containment or does he operate

as the benificent manipulator of the bureaucracy and protector of the innocent? What kinds of work do they do--recruiting, budgeting, personnel matters, educating and advising, infighting (Presthus, 1962)? Or can we more accurately characterize them, as Caplow and McGee (1958) have done, in terms of the robber baron, lord of the mountain fief, yeoman farmer, gentleman adventurer, honest burgher, king's man and boy ruler. Are they professional or profess-orial (Beach, 1968) in their approach to the job and do they see themselves as having little active control but endowed with a great deal of passive control? Or is there a sense of possessing few sanctions and little power but achievement of a satisfactory role through interpersonal ability and contacts (Hill and French, 1967; Demerath, Stephens and Taylor, 1967)?

Our interviews force us to face the nature and dimensions of the concern for resources and facilities. To an interested outsider this concern seems to dominate consciousness both within and across institutions. If there is a common interest and shared concern it is how to get money. Corresponding to a similar finding in our questionnaire is the lack of interest in the substance of teaching and research--certainly the mechanics of both (funds, space, production measures) are dealt with, but the meaning, content and importance seem to have little to do with the everyday work of the department chairman. We feel that this is evidence for a sense of anti-intellectualism in our institutions. More important is the fact that the department chairman is seen as a leader of the faculty and a representative of it and thus symbolizes the widespread lack of interest in things that are important to students.

Recruiting:

Recruiting, as other studies have shown, is an obsession with departmental chairmen and it may consume up to 70 or 80 per cent of a mans' time. One reason for the centrality of this concern is that the internal process of procuring a job opening is so unwieldy--in one institution it was based on an elaborate statistical formulation handed down from the state and in several others there was an elaborate routine that called for forcing a request through at least four hierarchical levels.

The dean who has to deal with several chairmen may leave the competition for spaces open, divide the spoils, try to develop a set of criteria that will apportion the positions, try to reach a consensus or make an arbitrary decision--whatever the technique the chairmen are usually dissatisfied. The dean's style leads to counter styles and those that appear to be most satisfactory are the man on the make, the hustler and the political strategist.

Additional concern about and dissatisfaction with the recruiting process in public institutions revolves around a feeling of tightly set boundaries that are set from above. That is, the department chairman not only feels that he is told to go and get someone but in addition he feels he lacks backup support and can suffer arbitrary and last moment restraint.

In every department we visited we saw that there was some form of consultation with faculty about adding new personnel. The range and style of such consultation, however, is enormous. It is apparent that there is peer judgment exerted but it is most often based on a cursory examination of documents or a quick in-person contact. What is truly amazing is the amount of high cost administrative labor expended on recruiting regardless of the length or rank of the opening.

Promotion is a similar issue but the impact of the department chairman is more intangible. While it goes without saying that a good deal of the initiative lies in his hands, the chairman is, for the most part, limited and split by both the faculty and

the administration. Consultation with the faculty is paramount but the movements within the administration are far more circumscribed and may even involve a ritual dance that determines the outcome. Our data indicates that the departmental chairman's involvement is primarily mechanical and the leadership dimension may be severely curtailed. The departmental chairman does, however, derive a great deal of satisfaction from the ritual and mechanics of the process.

Budgeting:

Concern with the budget is to the departmental chairman what sex is to the committed Freudian--the center of every activity and the motive power for every waking moment. Budgeting may be arbitrary, ruthless and elaborate or simple and democratic; but in all but one of our public institutions it is a demanding process that includes elements of commodity trading, usury, pawnbrokerage and gambling with company funds. In other words bargains are struck, future committments are traded, favors are sold and past debts are collected.

Part of this problem is caused by the strength that the state legislature or its designate has over the budgeting process--up to and including a monthly audit of class lists or inability to purchase essential equipment because it is not on an approved list--and an archaic insistence on line item budgeting. Certain strategies are developed to deal with the perceived penury and they include whining, wheedling and committing the institution to a project without permission, to illegally shifting funds from one account to another. It is also apparent that the "fair haired boy" and the department that is being "built or reconditioned" get their share without hustling as hard as the others.

Time budgeting is also an important function of the departmental chairman and it is here that he can exercise some of his few sanctions. Most departments and institutions recognize that time is spent in activities outside the classroom, like committee work and research, but there is a tendency to almost exclusively reward time devoted to research. In the transitional or democratized institution there is wide dissatisfaction with this reward structure but little concept of how to change it.

Group Relations:

It has been noted that part of the departmental chairman's job is student advising and faculty training and evaluation. We find little evidence of any marked amount of such activity. Indeed it is our impression that most chairmen operate in an almost mechanistic fashion--that is, their concern for people is a concern about the individuals as interchangeable parts in a functioning machine. An interesting sidelight is that we would have predicted a relatively high level of discontent on the part of the chairman when his major efforts are directed in the ways we have just indicated, but there was little--in fact we find that the departmental chairman is rarely dissatisfied, while others in the institution are often unhappy with the dimensions of the job.

We find little familiarity with or satisfaction about goal setting and maintenance on either departmental or institutional levels. Even the institutions in transition have few chairmen who feel much personal potency in the arena of establishing directions. A large measure of their complaints do deal with what they perceive to be a failure in this role by the central administration.

As Richard Farina once suggested, in another context, the departmental chairman has been down so long that everything looks like up. Still we are puzzled about the fact that the chairman does his jobs, such as they are, tolerates or perhaps enjoys his

mixed perceptual field and rarely indicates signs of discontent or anguish. No ecstacy either probably, but one would hope for some signs of agony in a conflicted and dissonant role.

The faculty senate and the committee structure in general, are bones of contention no matter what their perceived power and influence in the institution. Two feelings seem to be most representative; the first is an appalling sense of hopelessness due to inaccessibility or inability to manipulate the levers of power while the second is a sense of frustration due to the lack of time and energy to be involved and influential in the open arena. Those departmental chairmen who preside in an institution where committee power is severely limited or nonexistant bemoan their lack of influence unless they are a part of the informal "old boy" network while those in democratized (or is it politicized) institutions decry the impossibility of operating in such a fatiguing system.

Almost every department chairman we saw was self-perceived as operating on an influential committee and saw his participation as a significant part of the job. Some chairmen interacted with deans and/or fellow chairmen and exercised rather wide control over staffing, budgeting, and planning while others were shunted off into institutional broom closets where they could indulge in administrative onanism or entertain their fantasies as power freaks. The point remains--even in institutions where committees may be impotent the committee structure is embraced by the chairman as a critical part of the job.

This group ethic, no matter how authoritarian the chairman was in actuality, affects the interaction of the department as a whole for we found no department where internal committee work was not crucial. The composition of such committees varied widely as did the way the members were selected but it is clear that the chairman opts for peer oriented participation and tends to forget or overlook student input.

Styles of Operation:

Stylistically we feel that there are several examples that may well illustrate some of our previous points. While they share some elements with the characterizations of Caplow and McGee we feel the roles are based on a broader enquiry.

1. the politician/power broker
may be internally oriented and thus practice his ward heeling or vote swapping solely within the institution with people that basically share his local interests and power. He may be personally strong but his real potency comes from alliances that are issues oriented and primarily non-ideological. The externally oriented, on the other hand has enormous prestige with non-academic outsiders--usually legislators--or has performed many services for powerful people and thus can call favors due him. He can often call the shots administratively within the university if he is so inclined but refrains from doing so because he is busy establishing other debts in his favor. As long as whatever advice he offers is followed he is a slumbering giant.

2. the entrepreneur/hustler
is the man on the make and is most often deeply involved in research and grantsmanship. He is well connected at the foundation, government or industrial level and his influence is directly related to the money he brings in. He was formerly considered an empire builder, and may be thought of in those terms by older faculty, but realistically he threatens only those competing for the same money or space.

3. the enforcer/ bureaucrat
is rules and procedures oriented to the extent of having a clear view of the channels which he uses easily and effectively. He is often disconcerted by and punitive towards those who operate outside of channels from ignorance or hostility.

4. "K" (of Kafka's novel)
is the department chairman who goes on forever looking for the proper channels and can never find them. He looks hard but is immune to the clues. He feels judged but doesn't know what the criteria are or what the results will be.

5. the gigolo
earns his keep by dancing with the administration in order to keep them out of departmental affairs which are handled by the senior faculty. While he is not respected, admired or liked by his peers, he is tolerated for his utility.

6. the arbiter
seeks not to lead but to serve as mediator of diverse groups and acts to shape an acceptable decision through an ability to stay seated for an inordinate length of time.

7. the facilitator
is similar to number 6 but is more concerned with the concept of self-actualization and maximizing human potential than settling conflict. He may see his role as educator or confronter but his orientation is growth of the individual and group.

In summation let us point out that the department chairman is operationally conflicted and the man in the middle in an institution where middle men are viewed as used car salesmen. It is relevant to ask why a man in such a position is useful or happy and to suggest to those interested in change that such positions are useful starting points.

Anderson, K. J. The Ambivalent Department, Educational Record, 49:3,206-13, 1968.

Beach, M. Professional versus Professorial Control of Higher Education, Educational Record, 49:3, 263-73, 1968.

Caplow, T. and R.J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace, Basic Books, New York, 1958.

Dahl, R.A. Who Governs? Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961.

Demerath, N.J., R.W. Stephens and R.R. Taylor, Power, Presidents, and Professors, Basic Books, New York, 1967.

Hill, W.W. and W.L. French, Perceptions of the Power of Department Chairmen by Professors, Administrative Science Quarterly, 11:4, 548-74, 1967.

Hungate, T. L. Management in Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University Press, New York, 1964.

McKeachie, W. J. Memo to a New Department Chairman, Educational Record, 49:2,221-7, 1968.

Presthus, R.J. The Organizational Society, Random House, New York, 1962.

Walker, D.E. and D.C. Holmes, The University Professor and his Department, Educational Record, 41:1,34-6, 1966.